Dealing with unknown idiomatic expressions in L2 classroom

Juhi Kim

The Ohio State University

Abstract

Idiomatic expressions (IE) are so pervasive that the teacher and students can encounter them as unknown expressions in any classroom of language arts. Particularly in the L2 classroom, the unknown idiomatic expressions appear frequently and sporadically during the integrated classroom activities of listening, reading and writing. The unpredictability of occurrence of unknown idiomatic expressions during the class, which might hinder the students from following the primary class activity, requires the teacher's immediate treatment to make sense of how to proceed. The sporadic IE instructions in this sense are embedded in any integrated language classroom activity. Prior research into idiomatic expressions have focused on cognitive theory about the difference between L1 and L2 learners in their processing, teaching strategies for the effectiveness of IE instruction, etc. This study employs sequential analysis (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974) for the transcribed classroom interaction between the teacher and the student. Sequential analysis considers the meaning of every next turn in classroom discourse as an outcome of the contingently coordinated interactional work (Moerman & Sacks, 1988). Through sequential analysis, this study examines how the teacher makes sense of the meaning of idiom instruction for the course of the classroom activity and produces language pedagogy in an actual classroom occasion.

Keywords: Idiomatic instruction, ESL classroom, classroom research, sequential analysis, conversation analysis

Introduction

Idioms are defined as "fixed and formulaic expressions", which cannot be predicted from the meaning of the individual words that comprise them (Carter, 1998). Bachman (1996) categorized idioms as sociolinguistic knowledge that can only be achieved by cultural understanding of the target community. Despite the numerous studies about idiom instruction for L1 and L2 learners, the unpredictability and arbitrariness of idioms and the cultural relativity of metaphoric expressions make it difficult for L2 learners to understand idioms, that is, unknown expressions. L2 learners encounter the

sporadic occurrence of unknown expressions, which are called idiomatic or figurative expressions throughout a lesson. This sporadic occurrence of unknown idiomatic expressions is a burden on L2 learners as they follow the integrated language activities in class and also on the teacher in how they instruct the students to accomplish the primary objectives. In this regard, instruction of idiomatic expressions in an L2 classroom becomes a thorny issue in terms of its feasibility and practicality.

Thus, in this paper, I intend to look into how the idiomatic expression (IE) instruction that occurs sporadically in L2 classrooms is dealt with and how the instruction is shaped in the interaction between the teacher and the students. Firstly, I will start by reviewing the literature on how idioms or idiomatic expressions (IE) have been dealt with in the field of language education and which teaching strategies were suggested to instruct L2 learners. Secondly, I will present how IE instruction works in an actual occasion in a L2 classroom through sequential analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Then, in the conclusion, I will discuss how IE instruction has been approached differently in its way of taking interest in actual classroom interaction.

Literature Review

How to define idioms

Idioms have been identified as "formulas", "chunks", or "fixed expressions", which refer to "unanalyzed language". Idioms are made up of multiple words where the meaning is not derived by consulting the individual words. In this sense, idioms are arbitrary expressions whose meaning is unmotivated (Kövecses & Szabo, 1996). Motivation refers to a listener's ability to make sense of an idiomatic expression by reactivating or remotivating its figurativity, that is, using the literal meanings of the individual words of the idiom to understand why the idiom has that the specific meaning. (Langlotz, 2006, p. 45) For example, "tip of the iceberg" (small piece of a big hidden problem) can be motivated on the basis of our knowledge about icebergs and the problems they cause for navigation. However, "piece of cake" (something that is very easy to do) is unmotivated for most speakers of English because they have lost the metaphorical ground to make sense of this idiom. Lakoff (1987) discussed the motivation of idioms by using the example "spill the beans" as a conceptual metaphor that the speakers or listeners have. Through conceptual metaphors, people can associate the conceptual knowledge of "spill the beans" to the metaphorical knowledge of the idiomatic meaning ("reveal the secret"). Kövecses and Szabo (1996) classified idiom as a "mixed bag" that encompasses metaphor, metonymies, pairs of words, similes, sayings and phrasal verbs, and grammatical idioms. Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow (1994) categorized idioms with more flexibility, being a "fuzzy category" that

contains characteristics such as conventionality, inflexibility, figuration, proverbiality, informality and affect. Nunberg, et al. (1994) rejected the traditional view of idioms as arbitrary expressions and argued against the non-arbitrary features of idioms. They also criticized the claim of idioms as being single, arbitrary, semantic representations:

> To justify this claim […] it has to be shown not just that the meaning of the idiom could not be predicted on the basis of a knowledge of the meanings of its parts, but that once the meaning of the idiom is known […] it cannot be devolved on the constituents of the expressions. (p. 496)

Those who support non-arbitrary features of idioms are grouped within the Cognitive Semantics school of thought. Lakoff, Langacker, and Johnson (1980) proposed a conceptual basis for idiomatic expressions, a model known as "cognitive linguistics". They argued that idioms have compositional features, which can be predicted by the meanings of the individual words in the conceptual metaphorical system. This conceptual system (Kövecses & Szabo, 1996; Lakoff 1993) connects two domains of knowledge: one is a familiar, physical domain called a source-domain; and the other is a less familiar, abstract domain called a target-domain. The source-domain provides understanding of the target-domain, which the figurative expression expresses. These researchers consider idioms to be highly motivated. Gibbs (1994) suggests that people attempt to do compositional analyses when they try to interpret figurative, idiomatic expressions. Cognitive semantic theory matches well with transparent, compositional idiom expressions; however, for opaque idiomatic expressions, Nunberg, et al (1994) make a distinction between idioms and "idiomatically combining expressions" (for short, "idiomatic combinations"), which refer respectively to idiomatic phrases that can be decomposable, i.e., "all bark and no bite" (when someone is aggressive but not willing to engage in a fight) and to idioms that have to be understood as a whole chunk, i.e., "break a leg" (good luck!) and" dry run" (rehearsal).

Later, Nunberg, et al, were attacked for their concept of conceptual metaphor. Cacciari and Glucksberg (1994) argued that conceptual knowledge is developmental in its nature and questioned the universality of a conceptual metaphor system. Keysar and Bly (1999) also claimed that idioms cannot be used to argue for the existence of conceptual structures. They claimed that the relation between idioms and their metaphorical meaning is not because of the same conceptual system but because of the nature of interpretive strategies.

Idiom comprehension processing in L1 and L2

To date, there have been four theories of idiom comprehension. The first theory is called the Idiomatic Processing Model. According to this view, an idiom is processed first figuratively when it is encountered by the native

speaker. Then, when this model is not productive, a literal interpretation mode is activated (Schweigert & Moates, 1988). Due to the familiar conventionality of idioms, they claimed that the idiomatic processing mode gives the first priority to the figurative interpretation.

Bobrow and Bell (1973) and Burbules, Schraw and Trathen (1989) proposed the Literal Processing Model, which means, an idiom is processed literally first when it is encountered by the native speaker. Then only if the case is not productive with the literal processing mode, the figurative processing mode is activated. Later, Schhraw (1995) replicated these findings and proposed the Focus-Shifting Hypothesis, which is that native speakers shift their focus to figurative interpretation mode in order to understand idioms only when their attempt fails to understand idioms literally. Schraw (1995) conducted experiments in his study with undergraduate students in a large Western university to examine whether metaphorical and literal statements presented in context receive similar amounts of perceptual decoding. The result showed the processing time of metaphorical statements was longer than the literal processing time. According to the result, Schraw (1995) suggested that the difference in the processing time between metaphorical and literal statements is attributed to a shift in focus that occurs when interpreting metaphors.

The third theory is Direct Access Hypothesis, which was proposed by Gibbs (1980, 1984). Gibbs insisted that native speakers hardly consider the literal meaning of an idiomatic expression. They quickly bring the meaning of the idiom from their own mental lexicon. Because of the familiarity and conventionality of idioms, they do not need more time in order to process or activate literal interpretation mode to understand idioms. Gibbs argued that native speakers do not process the meaning of idioms literally first. They access the conventional figurative meaning of idioms directly, rather than processing the literal meaning of idioms.

The last model of idiom comprehension is Simultaneous Processing Model (Swinney & Cutler, 1979). This model suggested that the meaning of idioms is processed literally and figuratively at the same time rather than separately. In line with this model, Forrester (1995) argued that idiomatic expressions are frozen by their history of use and recognized conventionally as fixed expressions, rather than being processed consciously.

Having discussed above the four models of idiom comprehension, it seems that the traditional view of idioms is in line with both the idiomatic processing model and direct access hypothesis, which focus on opaque expressions and which are not derived from the individual words. On the other hand, the cognitive view with both the literal processing model and simultaneous processing model focus on transparent idioms, which are made up of individual constituents.

Teaching strategies for idiom instruction

Irujo (1986) and Kellerman (1979) conducted research about the idiom comprehension of L2 learners. They investigated L1 transfer to L2 idiom comprehension and, although there is no significant positive or negative L1 transfer in L2 idiom comprehension, they claimed that L1 still plays an important role in L2 idiom processing in its comprehension.

Regarding the metaphorical awareness of idiom instruction, Kövecses and Szabo (1996) conducted a study that examines the extent and the effectiveness of metaphoric-oriented instruction in foreign language context. Fifteen Hungarian students were asked to study ten phrasal verbs (e.g., turn up the heading, cheer someone up) with conceptual-metaphor explanations (e.g., more is up, happy is up). And another 15 Hungarian students were asked to study the same phrasal verbs with L1 translation. The result showed that those who were guided to use the cognitive linguistic method, which is a conceptual-metaphor explanation, performed 25% better compared to the students who were guided to memorize idioms with L1 explanation (Kövecses & Szabo, 1996).

In addition, Schmitt (1997) suggested "grouping" as an important factor that helps L2 learners to organize their vocabulary in an effective way. Based on the tenets of the cognitive linguistic view on idioms, he argued that metaphor is ubiquitous in everyday life in our conceptual system. Within the system, the meaning of idiom is not restricted as an arbitrary constituent; rather, it is motivated by three mechanisms: metaphor, metonymy, and conventional knowledge (Kövecses, 2002).

Following the discussions of idioms and metaphor, Boers (2000) and Littlemore (2001) asserted the importance of metaphorical awareness to improve L2 learners' idiom comprehension. Boers (2000) claimed that if learners are more sensitive to the metaphorical expressions in their everyday communication, the sensitivity will be helpful for figurative vocabulary learning and they will be able to maintain this knowledge longer in their memory. Littlemore (2001) claimed that L2 learners can enhance their metaphorical awareness by working with metaphorical vocabulary. In the similar vein, Andreou and Galantomos (2008) conducted a survey to examine the effectiveness of this method, which is increasing metaphoric awareness of learners in Greek idiom instruction. Their results showed that those who received the instruction to increase their metaphoric awareness achieved better performance in the idiom comprehension test than those who did not.

As shown above, connecting a speaker's conventional, cognitive knowledge to the metaphorical awareness helps the language learners to process idioms easily by being motivated. Motivation in this sense is a central element in the cognitive linguistic approach for idiom instruction. Through motivation, L2 learners who develop metaphorical competence obtain a better understanding of fixed expression more than those who did not obtain that

competence. In this approach, the link between idiomatic meaning and the literal words stems from the knowledge of the cognitive mechanism, which is about conventional knowledge.

For the classroom activities of idiom instruction, Boers (1999), Lazar (1996), Denigran, Gabrys and Solska (1997), and Liu (2008) offer sample activities that make the learners aware of metaphor in everyday life and to give them an opportunity to make cross-linguistic comparisons and to be able to express themselves in metaphorical terms as well. The activities that they suggested are as follows: gap-filling exercises, metaphoric themes recognition, story-telling based on pictures, retelling stories, idiom flash cards with images, playing idiom games, idiom dictionary, and completing a story or a paragraph (Andreou & Glantomos, 2008).

Similarly, Cooper (1998) suggested activities at each level of developing teaching materials such as choosing, discussing and defining idioms, and dividing idioms into groups. He suggested teaching activities using cartoons, newspapers and TV shows, retelling and add-on story, interviewing classmates, idiom-board games, idiom jazz and chants. Through these activities, L2 learners develop knowledge of understanding idioms by increasing their metaphorical awareness to improve their socio-linguistic competence.

In addition, Scarcella and Oxford (1992) stressed that teachers need to illustrate key vocabulary effectively by showing pictures and diagrams so as to improve the ESL students' reading comprehension. Mayer (1999) found that words and pictures presented together helped students recall better than with words alone as it is efficient to provide interesting pictures to foster and reinforce vocabulary development.

In order to increase the subsequent memorization of idiom expressions, Diez Arroyo (2000) suggests three ways of grouping idioms: lexical, syntactical, and topical features. With this grouping of idioms, she also suggested three types of exercises to guide L2 learners through the meaning of idioms: matching expressions, paraphrasing exercises, and contextualizing exercises. Matching expressions are suggested as a traditional approach. Paraphrasing exercises and contextualizing exercises are suggested to guide the learners to replace the appropriate idioms and to clarify the figurative interpretation of the fixed expression.

Regarding the effective teaching methods of idiom expression, Palmer, Shakelford, Miller, and Leclere (2006) suggested explicit instruction: using dialogue to contextualize the teaching materials, visualization, modeling, and the use of native language. With the use of various activities that integrate listening, speaking, reading and writing, L2 learners learn and practice how to utilize the idiom in various contexts. Wu (2008) suggested that retelling and rewriting through dialogue writing and role-play in reading are helpful for students to practice English idioms.

Thus far, I have reviewed the literature on how idioms have been defined, how they were studied in the comprehension process for language learners and how it has been suggested to instruct idioms in the classroom. Those studies for teaching suggestions were conducted as experimental studies based on the theory and cognitive studies about idioms and idiom processing.

In the next section, I will examine how idiomatic instruction occurs in an actual L2 classroom and how the instruction looks in its classroom interaction through the analysis of the sequential organization of turn taking between the teacher and the students. By employing Conversation Analysis (CA), I will examine how this instruction is performed in actual occasions, how the teacher discovers and responds to the need for idiom instruction, and how he/she guides the students to understand and produce the meaning of idioms.

Data Analysis

Conversation analysis and classroom instruction

Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) discussed that natural conversation anchors a linear array of "kinds of talk", each of which shows an orientation to a turn-taking system. Turn taking organizes the interaction of the parties, for which conversation shows its simplest systematics in its interaction (Sacks et al, 1974). Mehan (1979) described turn taking in classroom instruction as a sequence of three turns, which are well known as IRE (Initiation-Response-Evaluation): questions asked by the teacher, answers provided by the students, and remarks on the adequacy of answers in the teacher's third turn. McHoul (1978) also discussed the orderliness of formal talk in classroom interaction that is in line with Sacks et al (1974).

Developed by conversation analysts (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff et al., 1977), sequential organization refers to the way that speakers are oriented to prior talk in conversation. Each next turn represents how the speaker of the turn understands the previous turn (Moerman & Sacks, 1971, 1988). Moerman and Sacks (1988) showed how understanding is constantly displayed and negotiated in each turn of a conversation's sequential organization. Conversation in this sense is a procedural process toward understanding, which consists of what it takes to accomplish proper speaker transition through systematic analysis of the sequential organization of natural conversation. In this regard, understanding is a natural, social organization.

Payne and Hustler (1980) in particular discussed classroom interaction as the work of organizing by two parties: the teacher and the class through the distribution of turn takings between them. The order of the turn takings between the teacher and the class is accomplished in unnoticed ways that comprise a teacher's professional expertise. On each and every occasion of a

lesson, the teacher accomplishes the order in its instructional occasions. Through routines, the order of the turns in classroom interaction is an occasioned order, "there and then", in its accomplishment of the course of action (Payne & Hustler, 1980, p. 50).

IE instruction in an actual occasion

This is an ESL class with intermediate proficiency in a Mid-West University in the U.S. The students in this class are those who learned English as a foreign language. The lesson is a listening comprehension practice about world coffee prices.

The students listen to an audiotape and then the teacher asks them about what they heard. The teacher introduces several unknown words - idiomatic (figurative) expressions (IE) - from the audio script that might cause a problem for their understanding. After they listen to the segment, she checks their comprehension and moves on to the next segment of the audiotape.

Despite that the teacher tries to introduce the unknown IE proactively for the L2 students, the unknown IE appear frequently and sporadically during the class from the audiotape and from the teacher's explanation. Those unknown IEs require an urgent treatment by the teacher in order to move on to the primary class activity – listening comprehension practice. In this regard, the unknown IE instruction is embedded into the main classroom activity and this embedded instruction of dealing with unknown IE during the main class activity occurs consistently but unpredictably in the foreign language classroom.

Now I will turn to an actual classroom occasion and show how the teacher deals with the unknown idiomatic expressions during the main classroom activity. The students are listening to an audiotape and trying to figure out why the Columbian coffee growers are having problems.

Excerpt 1.

0	Tape:	*Slumping world coffee prices are driving many Columbian*
1		*growers out of business*
2	T:	Okay, there is(.) number one(.) (1.0)
3		Why are Columbian coffee growers having problems?
4	S1:	*new brand*
5	T:	Because of new bra:nd That's a good guess(.) Mohammad?
6		(7.0) ((The teacher rewinds the tape.))
7	T:	The first word he says is slumping
8		You know what slumping means? (1.0)
9		Going(.) do::wn(.) So (.) listen again
10	Tape:	*Slumping world coffee prices are driving many Columbian*
11		*growers out of business*

12	S1:	Low price=
13	T:	=Low price is for what=
14	S2:	=something
15	S1:	*coffee*
16	S?:	for coffee=
17	T:	=for coffee (1.0) Slumping(.) Coffee(.) prices
18		In the U.S?=No
19	S?:	*Columbia?*
20	T:	Where?
21	S?:	*Columbia*
22	T:	Columbia? (.) No
23	T:	*What else?*
24	S?:	( )
25	T:	Well(.) maybe (.) I'm asking the question(.) incorrectly(.) Listen
26	Tape:	*Slumping world coffee prices are driving many Columbian*
27		*growers out of business*
28	S?:	( )
29	T:	Okay(.) Slumping?
30	S?:	world=
31	T:	=world (.) coffee prices
32		(8.0)

The teacher asks a question with a known answer (QWKA) in line 3, "Why are the Columbian coffee growers having problems?" The teacher does not select anybody for the next turn as the question is addressed to everyone and relies on self-selection for the next turn. S1 in line 4 volunteers with uncertainty, marked by a soft voice. The teacher repeats the answer and assesses it as a "good guess", which shows that she is expecting to have a more accurate answer. She then re-winds the audiotape and by doing this, she implicitly is instructing the class that her question is one whose answer will be found by closely listening to it.

Before they listen to the tape, she gives the first word, "slumping", to the students. The IE instruction starts from the line 7. Since this is a listening comprehension practice, she assesses the long pause (7.0 sec) as possible difficulty for the students to figure out the idiomatic expression. She gives the first word, "slumping" and asks students the meaning of "slumping" in line 8. Following a (1.0) pause, she answers in line 9 by enacting its meaning, stretching the sound "do:wn" as a way of exaggeration. She shows the meaning of the figurative expression by performing the sound of its meaning.

This question and answer about the idiomatic expression "slumping" is embedded in the listening comprehension instruction. She identifies the expression as one that might hinder the students listening comprehension and provides the meaning of the idiomatic expression by enacting, i.e., stretching and exaggerating the sound with the indexical reference. This is part of what Payne and Hustler (1980) discussed as an experienced teacher's expertise. In each and every occasion, the teacher assesses the situation and accomplishes

the order of the occasion and employs a prompt strategy to solve the problem and move on to the sequence of the main instruction.

The teacher plays the tape and S1 in line 12 answers without being asked. This shows that the student considers the lines 4-9 as an embedded sequence to the sequence initiated in line 3, and that the question of line 3 is still unanswered. He displays his analysis of the discourse so far and attempts to answer the first initiation. Without a gap or overlap, in the next turn in line 13, the teacher invites the re-completion of his answer. That is, she is fishing for a more complete answer, gets a candidate in line 14 that she ignores, and then S1 speaks softly and adds "coffee" in line 15. And in line 16, she completes the expression that began in line 13, pauses (1.0), and then shows that it is the same as saying "slumping coffee prices".

In line 18, she begins the next sequence and asks a question to clarify their comprehension of "where" prices are slumping. She asks and answers her first question in line 18, "In the US? No." This produces a candidate answer in line 19, and in line 21 she revises her question by saying, "maybe I'm asking the question incorrectly," and returns to the audiotape. This shows her assessment about her own question and how she understood the students' lack of responses. Returning to the audiotape returns the class to the listening comprehension task.

After listening to the tape, she uses its first word, "slumping", to invite utterance completion; the students hear her invitation. A student produces the next word in line 30, and she accepts it and produces the rest of the key phrase. The line 31 is the answer to the first initiation in line 3 that led to the process of teaching the idiomatic expression, "slumping". She gets the answer by inviting completion of the turn and phrase that she begins. The answer was elicited as a collaborative turn, rather than as an answer to a question.

After the pause in line 32, the teacher shifts the topic from a comprehension of the audiotape to a question about its implications, and then to whether coffee is more or less popular.

Excerpt 2.

33	T:	So (.) that seems odd (.) doesn it?
34		Is the coffee getting more popular or less popular?
35	S?:	* more?*=
36	T:	=How about you (.) are you drinking more coffee now than
37		you did two years ago? About the same or less?
38		((to the student sitting in the front row))
39	S:	More=
40	T:	=More (1.0) And you are(.) buying it more from shops(.) right?
41		Everybody seems to be buying it(.) The astronaut ( ) remember?
42	Everybody seems to be buying it	
43	T:	Well(.) wouldn't you think Juan Valdez would be making

more (0.5) money?
S?: He shud=
T: =he shud> you think about it ((T, smiling))
Simz like he wud (.)
But apparently coffee prices(.) are going do:wn (.)
This is for the raw(.) coffee.
((She plays the next section of the tape))
Tape: *Even as retailers in the United States earn huge profits*
from selling lattes cappuccinos and mochas
Columbia's coffee growers are turning to an old friend
Juan Valdez to tap into the coffee-shop rage
T: Okay (.)
we have our barrel(.) tap(.) into(.)
((gesturing as tapping into a barrel with her hands))
What are they tapping into?
S ( )
T Juan Valdez (.) like (.) they are trying to tap into(.)
the coffee shop ra:ge
Where would you meet your conversation partner?
S: *coffee shop*=
T: =the coffee shop(.) Where would you meet um ten years ago?
S: [( )
T: [the restaurant (1.0) ((The students giggle)) café
Coffee shops were not that big(.) Not that popular(.)
Not that numerous
So (.) It's a ra:ge(.2) that means very popular(.) A lot of
((The teacher rewinds the tape.))
Tape: ((man's voice)) *Sibylla Brodzinsky reports from Bogota*
((woman's voice)) *For more than forty years Juan Valdez and*
his trusting mule have been promoting one hundred percent
Columbian coffee
T: Okay
S?: *( ) forty years*
T: for more than forty years (.) had been a percentage number
one hundred(.2)
Okay I promised you I would stop after one (.) that's two (.)
I will be quiet now because (.) we will continue with this
tomorrow (.)We will do some listening practice with it.

In line 34, the teacher asks whether the coffee is becoming more popular or less popular. S? answers in a soft voice and with uncertainty in line 35. This is an interesting part, which shows the student's uncertainty about the teacher's question, whether it is a question with a known answer about the audiotape, or whether it is a real question for their everyday life. The teacher selects the next turn to the students in the first row and asks the revised question. The student answers "More" in line 39. The teacher latches the answer by repeating it with the following one-second pause. That turn is

followed by the tag question "Right?" in line 40, which is to confirm the student's answer by soliciting agreement from the students.

The teacher's questioning continues about whether Juan Valdez would be making more money in lines 43-44. S? answers, "He should" and the student's answer is followed by the teacher repeating the answer, which is latched to the student's turn. This latched turn shows that the answer is a "preferred" one by the teacher (Pomerantz, 1984). In the next lines 47-49, the teacher clarifies that the coffee prices are going down and that it is for the raw coffee, which is guiding the students to the audiotape for further comprehension practice. She plays the tape.

Before she collects the answer about whether Juan Valdez would make more money, she introduces two new idiomatic expressions - potential trouble sources for the students: "tap into" and rage". In lines 55-58, she starts by showing what "tap into" means by using gestures and gives a more specific question about the tape, which also requires understanding the meaning of "tap into". This question is followed by the teacher's self-selected answer in lines 60-61. Then she solicits students' agreement that coffee shops are more popular now than ten years ago in lines 62-68. In line 69, she offers the definition for "rage" as "very popular and "a lot of", and demonstrates "rage" in how she says it by stretching the sound "ra:ge", which she mentioned in her self-selected answer (lines 60-61). Then she plays the audiotape for the next segment.

S? gives his hearing of the beginning part of the audio tape in a soft voice without being asked in line 76. S? shows his understanding of how the listening practice has been running and continues the activity by providing the answer for the segment they had just heard. The teacher repeats the student's turn, which is the beginning part of the segment of the audiotape and provides the latter part of the segment by rephrasing it. In lines 79-81, she brings the listening comprehension lesson to a close.

Concluding remarks

Idioms are so pervasive that students can encounter them as unknown expressions in any classroom of language arts. Teacher and students encounter idioms in any language activity – listening, reading, and writing – in an integrated language class. Whenever the teacher encounters idioms, he or she assesses the student's knowledge and determines where to start and how to proceed with the IE instruction to achieve the primary objectives of the class. The unpredictability of the potential problem of understanding idiomatic expressions in L2 classroom requires the teacher's ad hoc teaching techniques to make sense of how to proceed. However, the need for the teacher's impromptu teaching technique in that situation has been overlooked in the

literature and what the language instruction looks like with the sporadic occurrence of IE has been missed as well.

As discussed in the literature review, the majority of literature has focused on the cognitive developmental issues of language instruction and teaching strategies (Hellermann, 2008; Kasper, 2006) that were designed to enhance the effectiveness of IE instruction. The studies about idiom instruction considered language learning as acquiring a scientific, measurable knowledge, which can be designed and assessed for the effectiveness of learning and instructional methods. But considering the necessity of the teacher's ad hoc teaching strategies based on his/her interpretation of the moment-by-moment interaction and the teacher's assessment of the occasion, instruction is an occasioned, situated, sense-making practice of ordinary activity in the world (Macbeth, 1996) The majority of the previous literature ignored the peculiarity of the construction of situated knowledge in the classroom and the ways of knowing actual occasion without examining what is going on in the classroom in detail. This is because it views knowledge and instruction as information to be conveyed in the classroom, rather than as phenomena that can co-produce meaning as a socio-culturally situated, collaborative course of action. "Situatedness" enacts the meaning of indexical knowledge of the world through activity (Hellermann, 2008; Macbeth, 1996).

As shown in the actual occasion, IE instruction that is embedded into the integrated language instruction in this lesson is dealt with by the teacher's prompt ad hoc teaching techniques, "there and then" (Mortensen, 2011; Payne & Hustler, 1980), rather than following the various teaching suggestions in the formal analysis in IE mainstream literature. What the teacher does in the actual occasion is to try to get the students to recognize the meaning of idiomatic expressions by producing (re-complete the filling-up-question turn-by-turn) and making the connection between the indexical meaning in the context of the lesson, and the students' knowledge of their everyday life. This is invoking the students' knowledge from their "everyday life" and invites them to realize it by making use of the world that they have already encountered. In order to accomplish the connection successfully, the teacher shows the meaning of the idioms by enacting, performing, and summoning the knowledge that the students possess from their experiences. The teacher constantly tries to make the students connect their world and knowledge to the indexical meaning of the idiomatic expressions by enacting, interacting, and communicating with them. The teacher assesses every occasion continuously and determines the teaching strategies that are needed in the occasion to keep the lesson moving forward. IE instruction in an actual classroom is more dependent on the teacher's interpretation of moment-by-moment interaction and the teacher's assessment of the occasion.

The moment-by-moment talk in interaction installs knowledge in the classroom (Macbeth, 2003). Through questions with a known-answer, the teacher organizes participation and builds starting places to teach the lesson.

The process of pursuing the answer to the QWKA is a contingent organization of talk-in-interaction between the teacher and the students. The teacher employs strategies to elicit the known answer from the students by inviting collaborative completions, showing answers, and leading them to produce the expected answer. Students learn the idiomatic expression in their talk-in-interaction as a course of action in the classroom. From a sequential perspective, the students display how they understand the teacher's questions in their next turn, and the teacher shows his or her understanding of the students' response to the initial questions in her third turn. By the contingent sequential contexts of talk-in-interaction, the teacher makes meaning of the lesson as a course of action (Hellermann, 2008; Mehan, 1979).

Thus far, I discussed how the sporadic occurrence of unknown idiomatic expressions for language learners is dealt with in the foreign language classroom along with the discussion of idioms and IE instruction in prior literatures. As it is discussed in the analysis of the classroom transcripts, instruction in an actual occasion is a set of contingent, sequential interactions, which is enacted as a sense-making practice, rather than as a set of abstract, intangible cognitive knowledge that is conveyed as a standardized form.

Learning and teaching, knowing and doing are not separable. Through the situated talk-in-interaction, the teacher and the students co-produce knowledge by enacting its meaning. Learning, interaction, and knowledge are interdependent and are situated as an ordinary activity of the world as a practical, social action.

Appendix: Transcript notations

Transcripts notations are derived from the conventions developed by Sacks et al. (1974).

(.)	micro pause
(2.0)	Timed silence within or between adjacent utterances
//	Notes the point at which one speaker overlaps another.
=	Notes the ending of one utterance and the beginning of a next without gap or overlap.
_	Underlining indicates stress
(.h)	Indicates an in-breath
(h)	Indicates out breath
-	Hyphens indicate a word cut off in its production
* *	Notes soft speaking
:	A colon indicates a sound stretch on a word or word portion
( )	Empty indicates an unheard utterance
(( ))	Double parentheses contain descriptions of the scene
[	Left bracket indicates a simultaneous start by two speakers
]	Right bracket indicates two utterances ending simultaneously

Reference

Andreou, G., & Glantomos, L. (2008). Designing a conceptual syllabus for teaching metaphors and idioms n a foreign language context. *Porta Linguarum* 9, 69-77.

Bachman, L. (1996). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bobrow, S., & Bell, S. (1973). On catching on to idiomatic expressions. *Memory and Cognition*, *1*, 343-346.

Boers, F. (1999). When a bodily source domain becomes prominent: The joy of counting metaphors in the socio-economic domain. In R. W. Gibbs, & G. Steen (Eds.) *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 47-56). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Boers, F. (2000). Metaphoric awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*(4), 553-571.

Burbules, N., Schraw, G., & Trathen, W. (1989). Metaphor, idiom and figuration. *Metaphor and Symbolic activity*, *4*, 93-110.

Cacciari, C., & Glucksberg, S. (1994). Understanding figurative language. In M.A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), *Handbook of psycholinguistics* (pp. 447-477). New York: Academic Press.

Carter, R. (1998). *Vocabulary: Applied linguistics perspectives*. London & New York: Routledge.

Cooper, T. (1998). Teaching idioms. *Foreign Language Annals*, *31*, 255-266.

Diez Arroyo, M. (2000). Some reflexions on the study of idioms and consequences for L2 teaching. *A Journal of English and American Studies*, *21*, 27-47.

Forrester, M. (1995). Tropic implicature and context in the comprehension of idiomatic phrases. *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, *24*(1), 1-22.

Gibbs, R. W. (1980). Spilling the beans on understanding and memory for idioms in context. *Memory and Cognition*, *8*, 149-156.

Gibbs, R. W. (1984). Literal meaning and psychological theory. *Cognitive Science*, *8*, 274-304.

Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind, figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Irujo, S. (1986). A piece of care: Learning and teaching idioms. *ELT Journal*, *40*(3), 236-242.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, *19*, 83-99.

Kellerman, E. (1979). Transfer and non-transfer: Where we are now. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *2*, 37-57.

Keysar, B., & Bly, B. (1999). Do idioms reflect conceptual structure*? Journal of Pragmatic*s, *31*(12), 1559-1578.

Kövecses, Z., & Szabo, P. (1996). Idioms: A view from cognitive semantics. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*(3), 326-355.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor. A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed). *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 202-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we libe by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langlotz, A. (2006). *Idiomatic creativity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lazar, G. (1996). Using figurative language to expand students' vocabulary. *ELT Journal*, *50*, 43-51.

Littlemore, J. (2001). Metaphoric intelligence and foreign language learning. *Humanising Language Teaching*, *3*(2), Retrieved from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/mar01/mart1.htm

Macbeth, D. (1996). The discovery of situated worlds: Analytic Commitments, or moral orders? *Human Studies*, *19*, 267-287.

Macbeth, D. (2003). Huge Mehan's "Learning lessons" reconsidered: On the differences between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, *40*(1), 239-280.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language and Society*, *7*(2), 182-213.

Mayer, R. E. (1999). *Research-based principles for the design of instructional messages: The case of multimedia explanations*. Document Design, 1, 7-20.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lesson*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moerman, M., & Sacks, H. (1988). On understanding in the analysis of natural conversation, In M. Moerman (Ed.), *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis* (pp. 180-186). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mortensen, K. (2011). Doing word explanation in interaction. In G. Pallotti, & J. Wagner (Eds.). *L2 Learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 135-163). Honolulu: University of Hawaii National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Nunberg, G., Sag, I. A. & Wasow, T. (1994). Idioms. *Language*, *70* (3), 491-538.

Palmer, B. C., Shackelford, V. S., Miller, S. C., & Leclere, J. T. (2006). Bridging two worlds: Reading comprehension, figurative language instruction, and the English language-learner. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50*(4), 258-287.

Payne, G., & Hustler, D. (1980). Teaching the class: The practical management of a cohort. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *1*(1), 49-66.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff , E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *504*, 693-735.

Scarcella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom. Boston: Heinle & Heinle

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Languag*e, *53*(2), 363-382.

Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategies. In N. Schmitt, & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition, and pedagogy* (pp.199-227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schraw, G. (1995). Components of metaphoric processing. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 24(1), 23-38.

Schweigert, W., & Moates, D. (1988). Familiar idiom comprehension. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *17*, 281-296.

Swinney, D., & Cutler, A. (1979). The access and processing of idiomatic expressions. *Journal of Verbal learning and verbal behavior*, *18*, 523-534.

Wu, S. (2008). Effective activities for teaching English Idioms to EFL learners. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *XIV*(3), Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Wu-TeachingIdioms.html

Note on Contributor

Juhi Kim is a PhD candidate at the School of Teaching and Learning at The Ohio State University, USA. She has taught English in EFL/ESL settings for several years. Her research interests include ESL instruction and pedagogy, learner identity, and discourse analysis. Email contact: juhikim.1@gmail.com